

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended to improve form and provide improved correlation with the drawings and claims. Claims 13-21 have been added, and claims 1, 3-9, and 11-21 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101:

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner bases the rejection upon a statement in the specification related to carrier waves. While the applicants do not agree with this interpretation, because the specification previously defined computer readable media to include carrier waves as opposed to a computer readable information storage medium as recited in the claims, the applicants have amended the specification to bring the definition of computer readable medium in line with the understanding of a person of ordinary skill in the art. As such, a computer readable medium as defined in the specification encompasses purely statutory subject matter. Accordingly, the rejection under § 101 should be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lamkin et al. (U.S. Patent 7,178,106 B2). The applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "prohibit[ing]...the AV playback engine from being informed of the occurrence of the key input event. In maintaining the rejection, the Examiner construes the second event recited in claim 1 as corresponding to when the video is not playing in a full-screen mode. When the video is not playing in the full-screen mode Lamkin discloses that the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation (col. 19, lines 51-54). The Examiner construes the DVD navigator 422 as corresponding to the AV playback event, and construes the embedded web browser 410 as corresponding to the ENAV engine.

In order for a prior art reference to anticipate a claim, each and every element must be

found in the prior art reference, whether expressly or inherently. MPEP § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) Lamkin, however, does not expressly disclose how the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation. Claim 1 recites that the AV playback engine is prohibited from being informed of the occurrence of the key input event when a second event occurs. Lamkin, on the other hand, merely discloses that the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation, without disclosing how this functionality is to be expressed.

Lamkin suggests that the DVD navigator 422 will be "informed" of the navigation commands from the user remote control 730, but will not act upon those commands if the DVD navigator 422 determines that the video is not playing in a full-screen mode. Lamkin expressly discloses that input from the user remote control 730 is received by the DVD navigator 422 (shown by the arrow in FIG. 7; see also col. 11, lines 37-39, "). There is no component between the DVD navigator 422 and the user remote control 730 to prevent input from the user remote control 730 from being received by the DVD navigator 422. Lamkin does not disclose any mechanism by which the DVD navigation will not receive, and therefore not be informed of, the navigation commands from the user remote control 730. This indicates that the DVD navigator 422 will always be informed of key input events, such as key input events corresponding to the navigation buttons, even if the DVD navigator 422 subsequently determines not to act upon these events. Although it may be the case that a component would not receive a command and still be "informed" of the command, it is certainly true that a component that receives a command will also be "informed" of the command. Since the DVD navigator 422 will always receive key input events, as shown in FIG. 7, the DVD navigator 422 will therefore always be informed of those key input events. Lamkin therefore does not disclose wherein the ENAV engine refrains from informing the AV playback engine of the occurrence of the key input event, as recited in claim 1.

In addition, Lamkin also fails to disclose that the prohibiting occurs when a second event occurs using second event information recorded in the markup document, as recited in claim 1. Lamkin discloses that the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation unless video is playing in full-screen mode. While the Examiner relies on thus function as corresponding to the second event information recited in the claims, Lamkin does not indicate that this feature of the full-screen video mode is activated based on second event information recorded in the markup document. The disclosure in fact suggests that the button disabling feature will always be

present during the full-screen video mode, not that the feature can be triggered based on second event information included in the markup document. Beginning at column 24, Lamkin provides an extensive listing of commands that can be included in a markup document. None of these commands corresponds to the navigation button disabling feature disclosed at col. 19, lines 51-54, and the Examiner has not identified any command corresponding to the button disabling feature. This clearly indicates that the button disabling feature is independent of the commands that can be included in the markup document. Lamkin thus does not disclose wherein the ENAV engine refrains from informing the AV playback engine of the occurrence of the key input event based on second event information recorded in the markup document. Accordingly, Lamkin does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-9 and 11 depend from claim 1. The rejection of claims 3-9 and 11 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

The rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

NEW CLAIMS:

Claims 13-21 have been added, of which claims 13 and 17 are independent. Claims 13 and 17, as well as claims 14-16 and 18-21 depending therefrom, are deemed patentable for at least similar reasons as those given above with respect to claim 1.

CONCLUSION:

The applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response because no new issues are being raised and the amendment to the specification does not change the scope of the claims as would be understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 2/10/09

By: G. Clinton
Gregory L. Clinton
Registration No. 59,134

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510